

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present U.S. patent application. Claims 1-5, 7-17 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 15 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. Therefore, claims 1-5, 7-17 and 19-21 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Rejections of Claims 1 and 11-16 based on *Taniguchi* and *Holt*

Claims 1 and 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,162,756 issued to Taniguchi et al. (*Taniguchi*) in view of Electronic Circuits – Digital and Analog by Holt (*Holt*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 11-16 are not rendered obvious by *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt*.

Claim 1 recites the following:

a level control circuit configured to provide a level control signal that causes the first amplifier to operate in a saturated mode when the first amplifier is enabled, and a second output level control signal that causes the second amplifier to operate in a saturated mode when the second amplifier is enabled; and

a bias control circuitry to enable the first and second amplifiers in response to the level control signal, wherein the bias control circuitry enables the first amplifier when the analog level control signal indicates a low power mode and enables both the first and second amplifiers when the analog level control signal identifies a high power mode.

Claim 15 recites similar limitations.

Taniguchi discloses a high-frequency signal power divider/combiner. See Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 7-16 and 55-56. Applicant agrees with Examiner that *Taniguchi* does not disclose the level control circuit and bias control circuitry of claims 1 and 15. See Office Action, pages 2-3. However, Applicant does not necessarily agree with Examiner's other

interpretations of *Taniguchi* and expressly reserves the right to refute such interpretations in any future office actions if necessary.

According to the Examiner, *Holt* teaches a bias circuit and level control circuit, and it would have been obvious to provide *Taniguchi* with such circuits. See Office Action page 3. However, although a bias control circuit may be a necessary part of an amplifier circuit, *Holt* teaches no more than basic principles and theories of electronic circuits. *Holt* does not disclose the bias control circuitry or level control circuit of claims 1 and 15. Therefore, *Holt* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Taniguchi*.

Thus, *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* fails to disclose at least one limitation of claims 1 and 15. Consequently, claims 1 and 15 are not rendered obvious by *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 11-14 depend from claim 1. Claim 16 depends from claim 15. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits that claims 11-14 and 16 are not rendered obvious by *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Rejections of Claims 2, 4, 17 and 20 based on *Taniguchi*, *Holt* and *Cheng*

Claims 2, 4, 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt*, and further in view of *Cheng et al.*, U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0190790 (*Cheng*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that claims 2, 4, 17 and 20 are not rendered obvious by *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Cheng*.

Cheng was cited as teaching selectively supplying bias voltages to each of parallel-connected amplifiers. See Office Action page 4. As explained above, *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* fails to disclose the level control circuit and bias control circuitry of claims 1 and 15. Examiner does not assert that *Cheng* discloses the level control circuit and bias control circuitry of claims 1 and 15.

Applicant does not necessarily agree with Examiner's interpretation of *Cheng* and expressly reserves the right to refute such interpretations in any future office actions if necessary. However, regardless of whether Examiner's interpretations of *Cheng* are correct, *Cheng* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* explained above. Thus, *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Cheng* fails to disclose at least one limitation of claims 1 and 15. Consequently, claims 1 and 15 are not rendered obvious by *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Cheng* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1. Claims 17 and 20 depend from claim 15. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits that claims 2, 4, 17 and 20 are not rendered obvious by *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Cheng* for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to claims 1 and 15. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 2, 4, 17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Rejection of Claim 21 based on *Taniguchi*, *Holt*, *Cheng* and *Atwater*

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Cheng*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,189,732 issued to Atwater (*Atwater*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that claim 21 is not rendered obvious by *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt*, *Cheng* and *Atwater*.

Atwater was cited as teaching a circuit for providing a power supply voltage to an amplifier. See Office Action page 4. As explained above, *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Cheng* fails to disclose the level control circuit and bias control circuitry of claim 15. Examiner does not assert that *Atwater* discloses the level control circuit and bias control circuitry of claim 15.

Applicant does not necessarily agree with Examiner's interpretation of *Atwater* and expressly reserves the right to refute such interpretations in any future office actions if necessary. However, regardless of whether Examiner's interpretations of *Atwater* are correct, *Atwater* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Cheng* explained above. Thus, *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt*, *Cheng* and *Atwater* fails to disclose at least one limitation of claim 15. Consequently, claim 15 is not rendered obvious by *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt*, *Cheng* and *Atwater* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 21 depends from claim 15. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits that claim 21 is not rendered obvious by *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt*, *Cheng* and *Atwater* for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 15. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Rejection of Claim 3 based on *Taniguchi*, *Holt* and *Sevic*

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,069,525 issued to Sevic et al. (*Sevic*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that claim 3 is not rendered obvious by *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Sevic*.

Sevic was cited with regard to controlling both bias voltage and power supply voltage in response to an analog level control signal. See Office Action, page 5. As explained above, *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* fails to disclose the level control circuit and bias control circuitry of claim 1. Examiner does not assert that *Sevic* discloses the level control circuit and bias control circuitry of claim 1.

Applicant does not necessarily agree with Examiner's interpretation of *Sevic* and expressly reserves the right to refute such interpretations in any future office actions if necessary. However, regardless of whether Examiner's interpretations of *Sevic* are correct, *Sevic* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* explained above. Thus, *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Sevic* fails to disclose at least one limitation of claim 1. Consequently, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Sevic* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits that claim 3 is not rendered obvious by *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Sevic* for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Rejections of Claims 5, 7-10 and 19 based on *Taniguchi*, *Holt* and *Atwater*

Claims 5, 7-10 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt*, and further in view of *Atwater*. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that claims 5, 7-10 and 19 are not rendered obvious by *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Atwater*.

Atwater was cited with regard to a power supply circuit. See Office Action, page 6. As explained above, *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* fails to disclose the level control circuit and bias control circuitry of claims 1 and 15. Examiner does not assert that *Atwater* discloses the level control circuit and bias control circuitry of claims 1 and 15.

Again, Applicant does not necessarily agree with Examiner's interpretation of *Atwater* and expressly reserves the right to refute such interpretations in any future office actions if necessary. However, regardless of whether Examiner's interpretations of *Atwater* are correct, *Atwater* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* explained above. Thus, *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Atwater* fails to disclose at least one limitation of claims 1 and 15. Consequently, claims 1 and 15 are not rendered obvious by *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Atwater* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 5 and 7-10 depend from claim 1. Claim 19 depends from claim 15. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits that claims 5, 7-10 and 19 are not rendered obvious by *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Atwater* for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to claims 1 and 15. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 5, 7-10 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-5, 7-17 and 19-21 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the

undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 30, 2007



Joseph A. Pugh
Reg. No. 52,137

TriQuint Semiconductor, Inc.
2300 NE Brookwood Parkway
Hillsboro, OR 97124
(503) 615-9616